## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT For The Northern District Of California

**Entered on Docket** April 24, 2013 GLORIA L. FRANKLIN, CLERK U.S BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

United States Bankruptcy
NORTHEDM C---San Jose, California NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case No. 01-55137-ASW

SILICON VALLEY TELECOM EXCHANGE, LLC,

Chapter 11

Debtor.

## ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION

Before the Court is "Plan Proponents' Motion for Reconsideration and/or Clarification of the Memorandum of Decision Following Evidentiary Heard [sic]." In the motion, Debtor Silicon Valley Telecom Exchange, Silicon Valley Telecom & Internet Exchange, and Rubio & Associates, Inc. (collectively, "Movants") ask the Court to clarify certain aspects of the Court's March 4, 2013 Memorandum Decision Following Evidentiary Hearing (hereafter, "the Memorandum Decision"), and to reconsider the Memorandum Decision. Movants set the motion to be heard on April 26, 2013.

The instant motion was filed approximately 6 hours after Creditor David Tilem filed a notice of appeal to the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel ("the BAP"). The motion does not address whether this Court has jurisdiction to rule on the merits of the motion

Filed: 04/24/13 Doc# 1171 Entered: 04/24/13 13:55:18 1

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 l

27

28

given Mr. Tilem's appeal. However, as the BAP explained in Marino v. Classic Auto Refinishing, Inc. (In re Marino), 234 B.R. 767, 769 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999), reversed on other grounds, 181 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 1999), the filing of a notice of appeal has jurisdictional significance. When Mr. Tilem filed the notice of appeal, the effect was to divest the bankruptcy court of any control over the aspects of this case which are involved in the appeal, including the "jurisdiction to vacate or modify an order which is on appeal." Id. (citing Trulis v. Barton, 107 F.3d 685, 694-95 (9th Cir. 1995), and <u>In re Hagel</u>, 184 B.R. 793, 798 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1995); <u>In re Bialac</u>, 694 F.2d 625, 627 (9th Cir. 1982) ("Even though a bankruptcy court has wide latitude to reconsider and vacate its own prior decisions, not even a bankruptcy court may vacate or modify an order while on appeal."). A bankruptcy court simply cannot take actions "to expand upon or alter the judgment[.]" In re Marino, 234 B.R. at 770. However, a bankruptcy court retains jurisdiction to implement or enforce an order which is being appealed. <u>Id.</u> at 769-770.

The motion before this Court asks the Court to clarify the scope of the Memorandum Decision with regard to the employment of a certified public accountant and the accountant's specific duties. Movants seek clarification about the requirement to produce audited and certified financial statements, and argue that "audited reports are unduly expensive, unnecessary, and cannot be produced in the time allotted to submit reports to creditors." Movants also contend that "it is beyond the scope of an accountant's function to render opinions on the reasonableness or propriety of expenses[,]" and are concerned that the Court has ordered Debtor's accountant to

undertake such review. The motion acknowledges that Marcia Gerston, the attorney for David Tilem, was planning to file an appeal on this issue.

The motion seeks more than the mere definition of terms to aid with implementation. Instead, Movants have asked the Court to alter the Memorandum Decision itself. Because of the pending appeal, the Court lacks jurisdiction to order such relief. Therefore, the motion is denied, without prejudice, for lack of jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4 24 13

ARTHUR S. WEISSBRODT UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT For The Northern District Of California

27

28

```
Court Service List
1
2
   Silicon Valley Telecom Exchange
   250 Stockton Ave.
3
   San Jose, CA 95126
   Marc L. Pinckney
   4660 La Jolla Village Dr.
5
   Fifth Floor, PMB 50077
   San Diego, CA 92122
6
7
   Gregory J. Charles
   Law Offices of Gregory Charles
   2131 The Alameda #C2
   San Jose, CA 95126
9
10
   Bernard Greenfield &
   Marcia E. Gerston
11
   Greenfield Sullivan Draa & Harrington LLP
   55 S. Market St. #1500
12
   San Jose, CA 95113
13
   Courtesy Copies to:
14
   Scott Goodsell
15
   William Healy
   Campeau, Goodsell Smith
16
   440 N 1st St. #100
   San Jose, CA 95112
17
18
   David Tilem
   206 N Jackson St #201
19
   Glendale, CA 91206
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
```

Case: 01-55137 Doc# 1171 Filed: 04/24/13 Entered: 04/24/13 13:55:18 Page 4 of 4